REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-19, 21-31 and 33-43 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated April 10, 2009, claims 1, 4-19, 21-31 and 33-43 were rejected.

Claims 1, 7 and 31 are amended herein. Claims 1, 4-19, 21-31 and 33-43 are pending upon entrance of the amendment

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1, 13, 15-19, 21-31, and 38-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori, JP 10049761 and further in view of Lynch, U.S. Patent No. 7,174,151. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected as being unpatentable over Mori and Lynch and further in view of Wendelken, U.S. Patent No. 6,193,658. Claims 6-8, 11, and 33-34 are rejected as being unpatentable over Mori and Lynch and further in view of Ito, U.S. Patent No. 7,151, 613. Claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over Mori, Lynch, Ito, and further in view of Merchant, U.S. Patent No. 5,581,366. Claims 10 and 35 are rejected as being unpatentable over Mori and Lynch, and further in view Farrell, U.S. Patent No. 5,717,841. Claims 12 and 36 are rejected as being unpatentable over Mori and Lynch and further in view Huberman, U.S. Patent No. 6,115,718. Claims 14 and 37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Mori and Lynch and further in view Najeh, U.S. Patent No. 5,343,251. Claims 18 and 28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Mori and Lynch and further in view of Fujita, U.S. Patent No. 7,174,151. Claim 43 is rejected as being

unpatentable over Mori and Lynch and further in view Patton, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0101343. These rejections are traversed in view of the amended claims.

Amended claim 1 recites a printer for printing time-based media from a broadcast media feed, the printer comprising:

> a broadcast media receiver for receiving and outputting the broadcast media feed of time-based media;
>
> a content-based processing logic coupled to the broadcast media receiver for monitoring the broadcast media feed of time-based media to detect an occurrence of an event within the broadcast media feed, the content-based processing logic processing the broadcast media feed to generate an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event;
>
> a first output device in communication with the content-based processing logic to receive the electronic representation, the first output device automatically producing a corresponding electronic output from the received electronic representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event; and
>
> a second output device in communication with the content-based processing logic to receive the printable representation, the second output device automatically producing a corresponding printed output from the received printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to the generation of the printable representation.

The claim recites a broadcast media receiver that receives and outputs a broadcast media feed of time-based media. A content-based processing logic monitors the broadcast media feed of time-based media to detect an occurrence of an event within the broadcast media feed. Responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event, the content-based processing logic generates two representations of the broadcast media feed: 1) an electronic representation; and 2) a printable representation. Responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event, a first output device receives the electronic representation and automatically produces a corresponding electronic output from the received electronic representation of the

broadcast media feed. Responsive to the generation of the printable representation, a second output device receives the printable representation and automatically produces a corresponding printed output from the printable representation. Thus, the claimed invention beneficially monitors media for events that occur when a user is not present and can automatically generate a paper output and electronic output associated with the media without needing the user to issue any commands.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Mori. Specifically, as admitted by the Examiner, Mori does not disclose or suggest "a content-based processing logic for monitoring the broadcast media feed of time-based media to detect an occurrence of an event within the broadcast media feed." *See* Office Action, p. 4. Thus, it logically follows that Mori also does not disclose or suggest the "content-based processing logic processing the broadcast media feed to generate an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event." The Examiner relies on Lynch to disclose the feature regarding detection of the occurrence of the event within the broadcast media feed. However, the combination of Mori and Lynch do not disclose or suggest the recited feature.

Mori discloses a point of sale system that provides customers with servicing information at any time or place. *See* Mori, ¶ [0014]. As noted by the Examiner, Mori discloses receiving a broadcasting electric-wave and demodulating the wave for display purposes. *See* Mori, ¶ [0015]. Additionally, the Examiner notes Mori's disclosure of a print medium which prints receipt information. *See* Mori, ¶ [0016]. The Examiner asserts that Mori's demodulated wave and the receipt information prior to printing could be a corollary to the "electronic representation" and "printable representation," as claimed.

Lynch discloses monitoring for an Emergency Alert System (EAS) code within broadcast audio data that has been encoded with an ancillary code. *See* Lynch, col. 3, ll. 5-11. Responsive to detecting the ancillary code, Lynch discloses that the ancillary code is adjusted by an encoder in order to preserve the detectability of the EAS code in the broadcast audio data. *See* col. 3, ll. 10-15; col. 6, ll. 28-38. The Examiner asserts that Lynch's detection of the ancillary code within the broadcast audio data is a corollary to the feature of "detect[ing] an occurrence of an event within the broadcast media feed," as claimed.

The combination of Mori and Lynch does not disclose or suggest a content-based processing logic that "generate[s] an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event" within the broadcast media feed, as claimed. Although Mori discloses generating the demodulated wave and the receipt information, the generation of both elements is not responsive to detection of the occurrence of a single event within Mori's electric-wave which would be the closest corollary to the claimed feature. Rather, Mori discloses that the demodulation of the electric-wave is responsive to receiving the electric-wave and that the generation of the receipt information for printing is responsive to receiving an operator input to print the receipt information. *See* Mori, ¶¶ [0025] and [0037]. Thus, not only does Mori rely on two different events to generate the alleged "electronic representation" and "printable representation," the events do not occur "within the" electric-wave, as claimed.

Lynch does not remedy the deficiencies of Mori because Lynch does not disclose or suggest using the detection of the ancillary code to generate "an electronic representation and a printable representation of the broadcast media feed," as claimed. Rather, as mentioned above, Lynch simply discloses using an encoder to adjust the ancillary code in order to

preserve the detectability of the EAS code in the broadcast audio data. *See* col. 3, ll. 10-15; col. 6, ll. 28-38. Thus, the combination of Mori and Lynch does not disclose or suggest the recited feature.

Thus, for at least this reason, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references both alone and in combination. However, there are additional bases upon which claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Mori and Lynch.

Mori does not disclose or suggest a first output device "automatically producing a corresponding electronic output from the received electronic representation responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event." As noted by the Examiner, Mori discloses that the demodulated electric-wave is received by a displaying means which then displays an image based on the demodulated electric-wave. *See* Mori, ¶ [0015]. The Examiner asserts that the displayed image corresponds to the claimed "electronic output." *See* Office Action, p. 3. However, the displayed image is not produced "responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event," within the demodulated electric-wave, as claimed. Rather, in Mori the displayed image is displayed responsive to receiving the demodulated electric-wave.

Lynch does not remedy the deficiencies of Mori nor does the Examiner make this assertion. The Examiner merely applied Lynch to allegedly disclose other features in the claims. There is no hint, mention or disclosure in Lynch of "a first output device "automatically producing a corresponding electronic output from the received electronic representation responsive to detecting the occurrence of the event." As mentioned above, at best Lynch merely discloses using the encoder to adjust the ancillary code in order to preserve the detectability of the EAS code in the broadcast audio data responsive to detecting the ancillary code. *See* col. 3, ll. 10-15; col. 6, ll. 28-38.

Furthermore, Mori does not disclose or suggest a second output device that "automatically produc[es] a corresponding printed output from the received printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to the generation of the printable representation." As noted by the Examiner, Mori discloses a print medium which prints receipt information. *See* Mori, ¶ [0016]. However, Mori explicitly discloses that the receipt information is printed responsive to an operator instructing the system to print the receipt information. *See* Mori, ¶ [0037]. In contrast, the claimed invention "automatically produc[es] a corresponding printed output…responsive to the generation of the printable representation."

Lynch does not remedy the deficiencies of Mori nor does the Examiner make this assertion. The Examiner merely applied Lynch to allegedly disclose other features in the claims. There is no hint, mention or disclosure in Lynch of "a second output device "automatically producing a corresponding printed output from the received printable representation of the broadcast media feed responsive to the generation of the printable representation."

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for the reasons described above.

Claim 31 includes similar limitation as those recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references both alone and in combination for at least the reasons discussed above in regards to claim 1.

The obviousness rejection of claims 4-19, 21-30 and 33-43 only applied Mori in view of various combinations of other references including Lynch, Wendelken, Ito, Merchant, Farrell, Huberman, Najeh and Fujita for the dependent limitations in the claims. Wendelken, Ito, Merchant, Farrell, Huberman, Najeh and Fujita do not remedy the deficiencies of the references described above nor does the Examiner make this assertion. Dependent claims 4-19, 21-30 and 33-43 incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims. Applicants submit that claims 4-19, 21-30 and 33-43 are allowable for at least the reasons described above in regard to claims 1 and 31, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-19, 21-31 and 33-43, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 25, 2010

By: /Carlo Miguel C. Ocampo/

Agent for Assignee
Carlo Miguel C. Ocampo, Reg. No. 65,328
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)-335-7820
Fax: (650) 938-5200